Remarks

Claims 1-28 are pending in the application. All claims stand rejected. By this paper, claims 1, 15, 17, and 20 have been amended. New claims 29 and 30 have been added to provide claim coverage commensurate with the scope of the invention. No new matter has been added.

In the specification, the paragraph beginning at line 1 of page 16 has been amended to include the omitted reference numbers shown in FIG. 7. The applicants respectfully submit that this amendment satisfies the Examiner's drawing objection.

Claims 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Per the Examiner's suggestions, claims 17 and 20 have been amended to depend from claims 16 and 17, respectively, which is believed to satisfy the antecedent basis issues raised by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 9, 10, 13, 15, 23, 24, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Legall et al. ("Legall"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended merely to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. As amended, claim 1 recites a method for information monitoring, delivery, and notification comprising:

registering a user request for information;

<u>registering</u> user-specified criteria for delivery of the requested information <u>in response to a future triggering event independent of</u> locating the information;

monitoring one or more information sources for the triggering event specified in the delivery criteria;

<u>automatically</u> delivering the requested information from a particular information source to an Internet-enabled television system in response to the delivery criteria being satisfied; and

notifying a user concerning the delivered information using the Internet-enabled television system.

These claimed features are advantageous in that they allow a user to <u>register</u> a request for information or categories of information, even when the <u>information</u> does not vet exist or is continually in flux, such as stock prices. In addition, the user registers criteria for <u>a future event</u> that will trigger the delivery of the information, e.g., stock prices rising or falling by a particular threshold. Once the event occurs, the requested information is <u>automatically</u> delivered (*i.e.*, without user intervention) to the user's Internet-enabled television system.

By contrast, Legall merely discloses a conventional search engine that immediately provides existing results in response to a query. The examiner apparently equates Legall's "topics" with the claimed "delivery criteria." However, claim 1 recites two separate entities—requested information and delivery criteria. Legall's topics are, at best, requests for information, not criteria for triggering delivery in response to a future event that is independent of locating the information, as claimed. If Legall's topics are the claimed delivery criteria, what corresponds to his requested information?

Unlike the claimed invention, Legall's delivery of search results is not conditioned upon the occurrence of an independent future event, such as a change in stock price, the receipt of a breaking news report, or the like, as claimed. Indeed,

Legall fails to disclose or even suggest triggering events of the type claimed, such as the rising or falling of stock prices.

Furthermore, Legall can only find existing information. If a user enters a query for information that does not yet exist, Legall will either generate an error or simply not list the information in the search results. Registration of an information request differs from Legall's entering a query because registration does not require an immediate response.

In addition, unlike the claimed invention, Legall does not monitor one or more information sources for the triggering event specified in the delivery criteria. The Examiner apparently equates Legall's "searching" with the claimed "monitoring." However, those of skill in the art would normally understand monitoring to mean "waiting for an event" in the sense intended by the applicant, not a search of existing data as in Legall. No one would say, when typing in a query into Google, "I am monitoring Google for information." Such an interpretation distorts the ordinary meaning of the term.

As amended, claim 1 recites that the requested information is <u>automatically delivered</u> in response to the delivery criteria being satisfied. Legall's search cannot be said to be "automatic," since he must initiate a query each time the information is desired. By contrast, once an information request and delivery criteria have been <u>registered</u>, the claimed invention can <u>automatically</u> deliver updated information to the user each time a triggering event occurs. For example, every time a particular stock drops below a threshold value, the user can be notified on his Internet-enabled television system. This feature is impossible with Legall.

Claim 15 has been rewritten to include similar limitations to amended claim 1.

All other claims depend directly or indirectly on claims 1 and 15. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-28, as variously amended, are patentably distinct.

New claim 29 recites the method of claim 1, wherein the triggering event comprises a change in stock price. Likewise, new claim 30 recites of method of claim 1, wherein the triggering event comprises an impending broadcast of a particular television program. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose such events being used to trigger the delivery of information to an Internet-enabled television system.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims, *i.e.*, claims 1-30, are patentably distinct over the cited references.

Reconsideration and early allowance of all pending claims herein are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Digeo, Inc.

Kory D. Christensen

Registration No. 43,548

STOEL RIVES LLP
One Utah Center Suite 1100
201 S Main Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111-4904
Telephone: (801) 328-3131
Facsimile: (801) 578-6999